

**From:** mfonteno  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 3/25/03 11:00AM  
**Subject:** information concerning ownership regs

Dear Chairman Powell,

I recently read some of your comments from the field hearings concerning ownership rules and regulations. You mentioned that four ownership rules have been challenged five times in the past two years. To what rules and challenges [court cases (if any) or proceedings] were you referring? I'm currently working on an academic paper centering on FCC ownership rules and the First Amendment. Any help would be greatly appreciated.

Thank you,

Maria Fontenot  
Doctoral Student  
Department of Broadcasting  
University of Tennessee

**From:** Jean Yates  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 3/25/03 12:16PM  
**Subject:** Hold Public Hearings

Dear Secretary Powell;

There should be public hearings held before the Federal Communications Commission takes any further action on relaxing media ownership rules.

The FCC must be as responsive to the public as it is to the big corporations.

I have just found out that some of these rules that could give every local broadcast station a second channel on our cable system. These rules might make it impossible for us to receive C-SPAN and C-SPAN 2.

These rules cannot and should not endanger our reception of C-SPAN and C-SPAN 2.

The C-SPAN channels were conceived and have been maintained as a public service by the Cable Networks. These channels are the only direct links to the actions of Congress, interviews with news makers, and weekend programs.

C-SPAN and C-SPAN 2 are the only sources of "unfiltered" congressional news for the public.

Please honor the rights of the public to greater sources of information as a moral obligation. Please hold public hearings and listen to the public Sincerely,

Sabina Yates

302 Bridgeview Ct.

Benicia, CA 94510

Jean Yates  
redfoxred@earthlink.net  
Why Wait? Move to EarthLink.

**From:** Hanah Metchis  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 3/26/03 8:49AM  
**Subject:** CEI C:Spin - Who to Watch?

CEI C:SPIN

This issue: Who to Watch? The Iraqi War and the Myth of Media Concentration.

This week's c:\spin is by James Gattuso, Research Associate, Project on Technology and Innovation, CEI, March 26, 2003.

In Washington, the crowd of lawyers, lobbyists, and think tank analysts have gone through the motions of their usual routines this week, talking and writing about the vast multitude of policy issues that make Washington Washington. Yet, despite outward appearance, only one issue is on people's minds: the war in Iraq.

Like millions of others across America, I found myself glued to the television last Wednesday night, watching media reports on the launch of military action. And, like many others, one outlet wasn't enough. Starting with CNN, I watched Aaron Brown's comforting coverage of the unfolding events. Perhaps it was too comforting, I thought, so I switched to Tom Brokaw, who had a more urgent tone. Then to Fox for the conservative spin. Then to Rather, for the, uh, Rather spin.

For better or worse, media coverage of this conflict is comprehensive and diverse. This is an inconvenient fact for those arguing that the mega-mergers of recent years would lead to a dangerous concentration in media. To the contrary, sources and outlets available for news are broader and more varied than ever before. In the 1960s, for example, the sources available to Americans for news on the Vietnam War fairly limited. Three networks provided a half-hour or so of news nightly, in addition to the news offerings on a few independent channels (in large towns only), a few AM radio stations, and print media. By the time of the first Gulf War in 1991, the landscape had changed considerably. Cable TV had arrived, allowing CNN to make its mark on the news landscape.

Between 1991 and today, the world has changed by nearly as much again. Instead of one leading 24-hour news channel, there are three leading channels plus a number of smaller ones. As important, television is increasingly sharing the media stage with a new competitor: the Internet. With over half of all U.S. households now connected to the Internet, websites are increasingly becoming an alternative - and sometimes the primary - source of news for Americans. Thousands of people now get their news first from Drudge or a blogger instead of waiting for Brokaw or Jennings.

Critics of today's media market, of course, rightly point out that many outlets doesn't necessarily mean many owners. NBC, MSNBC and Msnbc.com are hardly independent voices. It's no secret that because of mergers and internal expansion, media firms today tend to own a multitude of outlets - putting

broadcast, cable, print and even Internet outlets under the same roof. But such "media empires" may actually be good for consumers, providing each outlet with the resources needed to do a better job.

Moreover, there's evidence that despite these cross-media holdings, ownership concentration is not increasing. A study released by the Federal Communications Commission last fall found that the number of separately owned media outlets skyrocketed between 1960 and 2000 - increasing over 90 percent in New York, for instance. Since 1980, levels have increased slightly in most cities.

This is more than an idle debate. In a few months, the FCC is expected to decide whether to ease several of its current media ownership limits. The debate promises to be a controversial one - rankling special interests whose market niches are protected by current rules as well as demagogues warning of growing media octopi. The debate will be filled with endless factoids and pleadings. But, just perhaps, when the commissioners finally sit down to assess the media marketplace, they will remember these days in March, and the cornucopia of information and perspectives that the market provided.

\* \* \* House Majority Leader Tom Delay To Speak at CEI Event \* \* \*

House Majority Leader Tom DeLay will be the keynote at the Competitive Enterprise Institute's Annual Dinner

May 20, 2003 \* Capital Hilton \* Washington, D.C.

For sponsorship and ticket information please contact Emily Duke at 202-331-2255 or [eduke@cei.org](mailto:eduke@cei.org).

To be added to the email list, please send a message to [hmetchis@cei.org](mailto:hmetchis@cei.org) with "subscribe cspin" in the subject line.

If you no longer wish to receive CEI's C:/SPIN or have been added to this list by mistake, please reply to this message with "remove" in the subject line.

This message was sent to: [mpowell@fcc.gov](mailto:mpowell@fcc.gov)

1001 Connecticut Ave. NW, S. 1250

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 331-1010      Website: [www.cei.org](http://www.cei.org)



**From:** Synergyphoto@aol.com  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 3/26/03 10:11AM  
**Subject:** Regulation

Dear sir,

I have very disturbed by the consolidation of radio and television stations under a very few large corporations in the last few years. Clear Channel Communications is a good example with over 1200 radio stations. This cannot help but lead to a reduction in differing points of view. KOA in Denver is a good example. They focus on very conservative talk show personalities who refuse to have a balanced discussion of issues with guests who have widely divergent political views: Rush Limbaugh, Mike Rosen and others are examples of their talk show hosts.

The exact opposite is a small radio station, KGNU, which is unable to get permission to have enough broadcasting power to reach Denver, a distance of about 30 miles.

It is obvious that big business and government are very cozy with each other which results in less competition. This lack of competition means that alternative political and social viewpoints are having a rough time getting on radio and TV. What is worse is the myth, spread by conservative organizations like the Heritage Foundation, that there is a "liberal media" that has taken over the airwaves. conservative

Power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely. This trend toward having media in the hands of fewer and fewer companies is threatening our democracy.

What will you do about this situation to make it easier for smaller companies to have access to radio and TV stations? It's about money now. Do you have the political courage to turn it around?

Jeff Black  
Synergy Photo/Graphics  
[www.synergyphotographics.com](http://www.synergyphotographics.com)  
1675 S. Birch St. #504  
Denver, Colorado 80222-4133  
Phone: 303-757-1866  
Fax: 303-757-1866  
Cell: 720-732-1690  
Email: synergyphoto@aol.com

**CC:** Synergyphoto@aol.com, evanart@concentric.net, felbel@ecofuture.org,  
DeLaraCom@aol.com, JusDux@aol.com, Aasteban@aol.com, raw@ecentral.com,  
SDWfriends@aol.com, SHOTELLCOM@aol.com

**From:** upNmountains  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** 3/26/03 10:57AM  
**Subject:** Clear Channel Communications

I am just an average fellow in the mountains of Tennessee who avoids politics but I have become appalled at the way Clear channel has used its media power to become an arm of the administration. Especially on organizing prowar rallies. Is there not anything that can be done to bring this to the public view make them accountable? Thanks for listening

gary westley  
greenback, tn 37742

**From:** Bruce Moreau  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 3/26/03 2:12PM  
**Subject:** Clear Channel Concern

I am writing this brief note as a private citizen (not as a part of an organized group or campaign) concerned about the effects of Clear Channel Entertainment's dominance of the Southern California FM radio market on the traditionally diverse and open people's airwaves.

The primary basis for my concern is the fact that Clear Channel operates several popular FM radio stations in the Los Angeles area (KIIS FM, KYSR FM, KOST FM, KBIG FM, etc.) and it appears as though the commercial breaks are synchronized to occur simultaneously between stations. In other words, switching from one Clear Channel station to another to avoid commercials more often than not leads to another commercial period than if you had switched to a non-Clear Channel station.

My professional background says this is good business sense you present a unified package of companies to an advertiser and point out that the negative effect of listeners switching channels is minimized with the dominant Clear Channel family. My libertarian side, however, thinks this may be a direct manipulation of the people's airwaves a simple business act that limits my listening choice as well as places other stations at a competitive disadvantage.

My hope is that the FCC, with its wealth of experts and public funding, is able to scientifically quantify what I have observed over the past few years and take action to address it. I believe that if large *corporations are going to be allowed to own several stations in a single market, that they must operate these stations openly, fairly and always in the best interest of the public.*

Thank you for your time.

Bruce Moreau  
1041 Bradshaw Avenue  
Monterey Park, CA 91754  
626-284-9905

---

Do you Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Platinum - Watch CBS' NCAA March Madness, live on your desktop!  
<http://platinum.yahoo.com>



**From:** Ron Watson  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 3/27/03 2:29AM  
**Subject:** Public Hearings

I noticed that there are no listings for public hearings on your site. It is nice to know that the FCC will allow us to speak publicly when it comes to the administration of the public airwaves and media consolidation, but unfortunately there is no link dedicated to public participation, so 90% of the visitors cannot find out when they could speak. An omission like that is sure to squash any concept of public participation in developing a vibrant and diverse media; God Bless America!

I should say that I am not surprised given your rush to abdicate the responsibility for the well being of the public to unaccountable corporate execs and their lust for profits. I wonder if you really know what you are doing? Have you ever thought about what your policies will produce?

Regards,

Ron Watson  
Hagerstown, MD.

**From:** Paul McQuillen  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 3/27/03 11:04AM  
**Subject:** WAR 24/7

I can't believe the licensing of public airwaves was intended to send propaganda and unbalanced opinions to the American people. WLS Chicago promotes WAR around the clock. This started way before we went to war. They are the only talk radio station in Chicago. Texas based Clear Channel somehow has accumulated 1300 radio stations (8 in Chicago) and they are aggressively promoting pro war rallies. The poor people (women and children) who march against war are being demonized by Clear Channel and WLS. Clear Channel pushes Limbaugh's propaganda to 180 million Americans every week.

You might as well close your agency for you have failed the American people and democracy. Paul McQuillen

**From:** Charles Mansfield  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 3/27/03 4:46PM  
**Subject:** Upcoming FCC vote

Dear Commissioner:

Regarding the upcoming FCC vote, further consolidation of the media must be halted and in fact reversed. TV and radio news in the hands of a handful of profit-driven corporations has undermined our democracy more than any other modern force except the high cost of broadcast commercials during elections. The media companies have failed in their public trust to provide crucial unbiased information to the public about most public issues, most notably the drive to war in Iraq. As an American concerned about our democracy, I call on you to break up the media conglomerates, to open the spectrum to a wide diversity of organizations and independent journalists, and to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine.

Thank you,

Charles Mansfield

Los Angeles, CA

---

Protect your PC - [Click here for McAfee.com VirusScan Online](#)

**From:** Potholeontheroad@aol.com  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 3/27/03 9:43PM  
**Subject:** No to deregulation of FCC

Dear Sir,

It has come to my attention that the FCC is attempting to press ahead with deregulating the FCC. I am strongly opposed because independent newspapers across the United States are in danger of being bought out by multinational corporations. A free press is one of the rights guaranteed by our Bill of Rights. Please oppose this tyranny that seeks to squash free speech.

Sincerely,  
William Patterson  
Miami, Florida

**From:** Pete Romeyn  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 3/28/03 12:11PM  
**Subject:** <No Subject>

I want to express my support for Senator Feingold's proposed legislation re diversity in radio.

It's disturbing to see the way that companies like Clear Channel are limiting and homogenizing the airwaves.

**From:** Scott Emel  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 3/28/03 2:08PM  
**Subject:** Opposing "Digital Must Carry"

Mr. Powell,

I'm writing to voice my opinion against the "Digital Must Carry" proposal, this will limit programs to viewers like myself. I'm also opposed to the liberal relaxation of the FCC guidelines of on media ownership of radio stations, television, and newspapers.

The media first and foremost belongs to the people. The media corporations are ruining journalism as we know it, not too mention the lack of substance, and skewed view these corporations promote on air, and in print.

Your responsibility is to oversee that ownership of our precious media resources are not abused.

Sincerely,

Terrie Emel  
905 Longleaf Lane  
Conroe, TX. 77302

**From:** NadinB@aol.com  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** 3/29/03 1:24AM  
**Subject:** With all due respect Sir

Nadin Abbott  
1979 D Hammond Cri  
Honolulu, HI 96818

Dear Sirs:

With all due respect but not only are further public hearings on further concentration of the media are needed, but in fact we should consider reenacting Fair Access Laws.

This is not a knee jerk reaction but one based on history.

When those Fair Access Rules were removed by President Reagan (as was needed for renewal of licenses) the silencing of voices began. The excuse was the market, but a view of chiefly the AM Radio these days is one inimical to a Democracy, but closer to any Authoritarian regime.

These days you can turn to any of the Right Wing programs in the AM Dial and hear the talking points of the day. they have nothing to do with fact. What they tend to do is more of personal attacks, personal destruction and closing the debate. This is not what the founding fathers meant as a free press, or what the Radio chiefly should be used for. Many of the statements made on any AM show are down right slanderous, yet they can get away with it, and most glaringly. alternate points of view cannot enter the discussion. I must ask, why is Sandy Rhodes not syndicated on Clear Channel? It is quite simple, she is not syndicated because she does not tote the ideological line and Clear Channel (with clear connections to the White House by the way, through Hicks) will not allow alternate views in talk shows or for that matter in music.

Now you tell me you want to remove the last limits to ownership. I know that from a business perspective this means only one News Room to serve a market instead of three or four. This also means a further closing of avenues of communication and discussion.

I must admit, this take over of the media, achieved over the last 10 years (and I blame both Democrats and Republicans) is very similar to that achieved in many authoritarian societies. Such as the USSR. Izvestia and Pravda had to get permission to publish even neutral editorials against the regime. One of the measures that Perestroika pushed was the opening of the media ... which led to the demise of the Party's organ, Pravda, which in the end was a good thing. Why did they fall? Russians knew it was a tool of the state.

US Media is not there yet, but not far from it, as coverage and discussion and debate around the war has proven. The opposition has all but been ignored, until it was way too large to ignore. Nobody who has valid points is allowed on the air, or if they are, they are screamed at ... because they are the loony left. It gets worst than that. We have people in the AM world calling people to intimidate or worst any person who opposes this. At this point it does not matter what my stand is on this war, just the observations, that the US Media is allowed a very small editorial Point of View since it is hyperconcentrated in the hands of six extremely large corporations. More glaringly, that personal threats are allowed to go on the air, with apparent impunity. (May I remind you of Gordon Liddy's suggestion that to kill Federal Agents back in '92 you only had to shoot them in the head? This has become the rule, not the exception, and Liddy is still on the air. see what I mean about blaming both sides of the Aisle?)

In other words there is no longer a mainstream left media, but boy there is a very well funded, mainstream Right Wing to extreme Right Wing Media ... and the homogeneity among the AM dial is reminiscent of Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia. (Yes, I am a trained Historian.) The papers are not yet as bad, and the

TV ... well CNN is Izvestial and FOX is Pravda.

Shame on you Mister Powell thinking that you are doing a service to the country by further concentrating the debate and stifling dissenting views. Yes, those who own the microphone control the message and it is time that you, and the rest of the FCC think of the good of the nation and surprise all of us by starting the reform needed to once again make our media the tool of a functioning democracy it should be. When the media becomes a megaphone for any party (the RW media has) we are one step away from a dictatorship of ideas.

It is so bad Sir, that these days I rarely listen to US Media, since quite frankly I cannot stand megaphones, and if they were megaphones for the other side I would be asking the same. I have taken to listening to British Media, Canadian, Australian, you get the picture. Every once in a while I do turn on US TV hoping that they have realized they have lost a good chunk of the viewership. You may not know this but Short Wave Radios have gone up in sales quite significantly ... you and the rest of the FCC should start wondering why.

Upton Sinclair said at one time that the job of the media was to make those in power neither comfortable or at ease. Our media no longer does that with the a particular section of the political spectrum, and when Al Jazeera starts lecturing us about a free and independent media (Yes they are as much propaganda as Fox, just another side of the same bloody coin) you should get worried.

Thanks for listening, and consider this Public Comment.

Sincerely,

Nadin Abbott  
A very Concerned American

cc

US Senator Akaha  
US Senator Inouye  
US Congressman Abercrombie

CC: senator@akaka.senate.gov, neil.abercrombie@mail.house.gov, fcc.gov



**From:** Rick Salazar  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 3/29/03 1:00PM  
**Subject:** decentralized media

Dear Chairman Powell,

Please appeal the recent Court of Appeals decision that overturned the television-cable cross-ownership rule and defend the 35 percent television ownership cap.

I am not willing to give up on trying to save a democratic, independent, diverse and decentralized media. The network news is especially troubling in its lack of coverage of diverse viewpoints and the kind of real news information US citizens need to self govern. It is just the same few canned news stories over and over....the same viewpoint over and over. If this trend continues with more media centralization of ownership, and the resulting loss of diversity, then our freedoms are in peril. (The corporations profits may be in peril too, as more and more people, like me, are beginning to turn off network news because of the problems I just sited.)

As Chairman of the FCC, your stewardship of the public's airways, and the public's trust, is needed to protect and promote the independence and diversity of our media.

Thank you.

Jenny Salazar

**From:** Rich12332@cs.com  
**To:** Rich12332@cs.com, Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** 3/29/03 1:25PM  
**Subject:** War

New York Times  
March 25, 2003  
Channels of Influence  
By PAUL KRUGMAN

By and large, recent pro-war rallies haven't drawn nearly as many people as antiwar rallies, but they have certainly been vehement. One of the most striking took place after Natalie Maines, lead singer for the Dixie Chicks, criticized President Bush: a crowd gathered in Louisiana to watch a 33,000-pound tractor smash a collection of Dixie Chicks CD's, tapes and other paraphernalia. To those familiar with 20th-century European history it seemed eerily reminiscent of. . . . But as Sinclair Lewis said, it can't happen here.

Who has been organizing those pro-war rallies? The answer, it turns out, is that they are being promoted by key players in the radio industry - with close links to the Bush administration.

The CD-smashing rally was organized by KRMD, part of Cumulus Media, a radio chain that has banned the Dixie Chicks from its playlists. Most of the pro-war demonstrations around the country have, however, been organized by stations owned by Clear Channel Communications, a behemoth based in San Antonio that controls more than 1,200 stations and increasingly dominates the airwaves.

The company claims that the demonstrations, which go under the name Rally for America, reflect the initiative of individual stations. But this is unlikely: according to Eric Boehlert, who has written revelatory articles about Clear Channel in Salon, the company is notorious - and widely hated - for its iron-fisted centralized control.

Until now, complaints about Clear Channel have focused on its business practices. Critics say it uses its power to squeeze recording companies and artists and contributes to the growing blandness of broadcast music. But now the company appears to be using its clout to help one side in a political dispute that deeply divides the nation.

Why would a media company insert itself into politics this way? It could, of course, simply be a matter of personal conviction on the part of management. But there are also good reasons for Clear Channel - which became a giant only in the last few years, after the Telecommunications Act of 1996 removed many restrictions on media ownership - to curry favor with the ruling party. On one side, Clear Channel is feeling some heat: it is being sued over allegations that it threatens to curtail the airplay of artists who don't tour with its concert division, and there are even some politicians who want to roll back the deregulation that made the company's growth possible. On the other side, the Federal Communications Commission is considering further deregulation that would allow Clear Channel to expand even further,

particularly into television.

Or perhaps the quid pro quo is more narrowly focused. Experienced Bushologists let out a collective "Aha!" when Clear Channel was revealed to be behind the pro-war rallies, because the company's top management has a history with George W. Bush. The vice chairman of Clear Channel is Tom Hicks, whose name may be familiar to readers of this column. When Mr. Bush was governor of Texas, Mr. Hicks was chairman of the University of Texas Investment Management Company, called Utimco, and Clear Channel's chairman, Lowry Mays, was on its board. Under Mr. Hicks, Utimco placed much of the university's endowment under the management of companies with strong Republican Party or Bush family ties. In 1998 Mr. Hicks purchased the Texas Rangers in a deal that made Mr. Bush a multimillionaire.

There's something happening here. What it is ain't exactly clear, but a good guess is that we're now seeing the next stage in the evolution of a new American oligarchy. As Jonathan Chait has written in *The New Republic*, in the Bush administration "government and business have melded into one big 'us.'" On almost every aspect of domestic policy, business interests rule: "Scores of midlevel appointees . . . now oversee industries for which they once worked." We should have realized that this is a two-way street: if politicians are busy doing favors for businesses that support them, why shouldn't we expect businesses to reciprocate by doing favors for those politicians - by, for example, organizing "grass roots" rallies on their behalf?

What makes it all possible, of course, is the absence of effective watchdogs. In the Clinton years the merest hint of impropriety quickly blew up into a huge scandal; these days, the scandalmongers are more likely to go after journalists who raise questions. Anyway, don't you know there's a war on?

Copyright 2003 The New York Times Company

**From:** H20Wise@aol.com  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 3/29/03 11:56PM  
**Subject:** Deregulation

Dear Mr. Powell, I feel the 1996 Telecommunications Act has done great harm to the diversity of viewpoints presented nationally as well as locally. When companies such as Clear Channel grow from 60 to over 1200 stations and centralized programming is instituted, the unique nature of each local community is sacrificed. Local interests are lost to a bland brand of programming that serves no one but the owners of the increasingly fewer and larger corporations now in control. Not only should we not further this trend, but we should work to reverse it. Thank you for considering my viewpoint. Hunter Ten Broeck  
Albuquerque New Mexico

**From:** eric unger  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 3/30/03 3:15PM  
**Subject:** local radio

good day,

i'm writing to express my belief in the power and importance of local radio. i think radio stations that are owned by people in the area with their intrests in that local area need to have right to be on the air protected. i get the impression that for a small radio station it is a constant battle to stay on the air. i believe that their rights should be protected and the importance of their existence should be understood and respected.

thanks for your time.                      eric unger

---

Do you Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Platinum - Watch CBS' NCAA March Madness, live on your desktop!

**From:** Mark Blanchard  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 3/31/03 11:49AM  
**Subject:** Threats of violence by a local radio station

Dear Mr. Powell:

Why are local radio stations under the arm of giant media concerns allowed to get away with situations that took place on the campus of Louisiana State University this past weekend?

A station owned by Citadel Communications called for a last minute protest (KOOJ in Baton Rouge, LA) -- against a small group of students (mostly female) who were supporting our troops but protesting the current administrations handling of the war.

These young women were bombarded with threats, curses and a disk jockey that said "they deserve a bullet in the back of the head." We currently have a serial killer on the loose here in Baton Rouge killing young women at Louisiana State University. These same young women received abusive phone calls from this radio station and their listeners.

I was on campus on Saturday when this took place -- for other reasons with my daughter -- and the display that was allowed to take place by this radio station was horrible. Women being called whores and bitches -- all being egged on by a radio station -- was awful.

Paul Krugman's article in the New York Times on 3/25/03 certainly hit home for me about how large radio conglomerates like Clear Communications are being given a free hand at whatever they want -- and are used to punish those that have a different point of view. When I called his office and emailed the story in the front page of our local paper on Sunday - I was told that this seems to be a pattern forming throughout our country.

I have always supported and prayed for your Father. He is a good man. Now is a time when we need good men to speak out against events taken place that Gobbels would be proud of.

Sincerely,

Mark Blanchard

---

This message has been checked for all known viruses by the  
MessageLabs Virus Scanning Service for the Diocese of Baton Rouge. For further information visit  
<http://www.messagelabs.com/stats.asp>

**From:** Jon Marcus  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 3/31/03 1:20PM  
**Subject:** Rules Relaxation

Dear Mr. Powell,

The state of news media reporting during and leading up to this conflict in Iraq should be evidence enough that allowing further consolidation of media is a horrible idea, and truly an unpatriotic disservice to the American people. Unfortunately I don't have any PAC backing me, like the corporate media does, and this is the very reason that YOU should be fighting for the people sir, and not for the select few with latent capitalistic agendas lurking behind their apparent journalistic ones.

The FCC's insistence on bowing to corporate media bullies over the last decade and more has had the effect of alienating the mainstream media from most of the well educated people's lives in this country. Further erosions in media integrity through conglomeration will only lead to a trickle down effect whereby less educated people will finally come to realize the fantastically shallow reporting of the major TV media through the rantings of people like me. Soon, the internet will be the only source left for any meaningful news, and there is little control over that medium. Thus, the corporate push to concentrate all forms of media in a few hands in the name of capitalism will have the effect of destroying the integrity and viability of the very goals of those corporations. Their capitalistic agendas will be destroyed by their neglect of their sworn apparent agendas, which are at total odds with each other.

Do not allow further restrictions on media ownership to be relaxed. Do your job and fight for the American people who are too busy trying to make a dollar to educate themselves on this crisis. Do your job and protect American values, please. After all, its our taxes that pay for all of this.

Sincerely,

Jon Marcus  
Santa Barbara, CA

**From:** Pjdouglas1@aol.com  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 3/31/03 4:11PM  
**Subject:** Dear Mr. Powell,

We do not want media ownership concentrated in the hands of the few. That is very scary. We must have independent news. Think of your children and grandchildren. They must live in a land of liberty with responsibility.

Thank you,

P.J.Douglas  
31775 Via Belardes  
San Juan Capistrano  
CA 92675



**From:** MT IV  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** 4/1/03 5:38PM  
**Subject:** You think this is OK???

Not to mention Clear Channel's censorship and condonement of running over protestors. Do your jobs or you'll be liable in big way.

Opposing groups use scare tactics  
War supporters threaten protesters

By Lauren Wilbert, Staff Writer  
April 01, 2003

Free speech in America has been fought for and protected since the beginning of the country's existence, and many court cases have developed in order to protect this constitutional right.

Some students, however, have experienced threatening responses and negative feedback from people who do not agree with their views about the war.

Saturday's anti-war protest by members from the Coalition for Alternatives to War on Iraq was interrupted by a group of bikers who used obscenity and violent threats toward the protesters.

The bikers were encouraged by Richard Condon, a local radio announcer from KOOJ FM, to meet the CAWI protesters.

Stacy Sauce, a mass communication junior and CAWI member, said the counter-protesters yelled at them and made the atmosphere uncomfortable for everyone there.

"The DJ told them to get drunk and bash the protesters," Sauce said. "I was with my friend and her two younger brothers, so we tried to stay out of the way."

She said the bikers even went so far as to rattle their engines during a speaker, so protesters could not hear the speeches.

Lee Abbott, an English senior, said it is an obligation in society to speak up when someone disagrees with something, and their peaceful protest was doing just that.

"I think it's a misunderstanding of what your freedoms are when you're protesting. And threatening lives and destroying unity are not a part of that," Abbott said.

He said the demonstrations from the bikers Saturday can intimidate anti-war protesters, but it would not discourage him from doing other protests.

"I'm sure it can scare people away, but when people have to resort to violence and violent remarks instead of data, it doesn't win the argument," Abbott said.

Shaun Treat, a speech communication professor, has a barrage of anti-war comics, articles and quotes on and around his office door. He has experienced firsthand the distaste of others who take a pro-war stance.